

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA DIVISION

| STEVE DAVIS, JR.,      | §                                |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Plaintiff,             | §                                |
|                        | <b>§</b>                         |
| VS.                    | § Civil Action No. 3:24-4519-MGL |
|                        | §                                |
| CT CORPORATION SYSTEM, | <b>§</b>                         |
| Defendant.             | §                                |

# ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, DISMISSING DEFENDANT FOR FAILURE TO EFFECTUATE PROPER SERVICE, AND SUMMARILY DISMISSING THIS CASE WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Plaintiff Steve Davis, Jr. (Davis), who is representing himself, filed this action against Defendant CT Corporation System (CTCS), alleging violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending the Court dismiss CTCS for Davis's failure to effectuate proper service and summarily dismiss this case without prejudice. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on November 26, 2024. To date, Davis has failed to file any objections.

"[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845–46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court CTCS is **DISMISSED** as a Defendant under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m), and this case is summarily **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

#### IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 16th day of December 2024, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis MARY GEIGER LEWIS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

## \*\*\*\*

### NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Davis is hereby notified of his right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.